

Technical Review Discussion with C6 on the April 2010 Draft UIC permit

Questions on the Redline of the draft permit submitted by C6

1. Page 9 – Why was the requirement for the computation of reservoir compressibility deleted?
2. Page 9 – Why was the reporting of the pressure build up deleted?
3. Page 11- please provide additional language on Fluorescein to include in the permit
4. Page 11 – provide additional explanation of the mini injectivity test – which formation will it be conducted on?
5. Page 11 – why “may” the initial FOT be conducted, rather than “shall” be conducted?
6. Page 13 – why is the final FOT deleted?
7. Page 17 – the application (Page 8 – Attachment P) says one well for seismic monitoring, permit now says three – please clarify. Also, need to include correct explanation of monitoring equipment and data to be provided.
8. Page 19 – what is the source of the carbon dioxide?
9. Page 28 – thermal conductivity monitoring – clarify wording of what information will be monitored and reported.
10. Additional Monitoring – if additional monitoring is proposed it should be identified and included in the permit.
11. Page 31 – must provide reports to agencies listed
12. Appendix I – Operation Time line – why deleted?

Additional questions from application

1. Attachment L, Page 12 – where is there an existing approved injection well in Rio Vista?
2. Attachment O, Page 1 – who is the Executive Director?
3. Attachment P. Page 8 – are there more details on the proposed 100 foot well for seismic monitoring?
4. How many seismic array wells will be installed and how does C6 plan to construct and permit these? Plans for their P&A?